

# RE: NM nutrients - Revised site list

Jessup, Benjamin to: Forrest John 10/17/2012 12:13 PM

From: "Jessup, Benjamin" <benjamin.jessup@tetratech.com>

To: Forrest John/R6/USEPA/US@EPA

### Hi Forrest:

Yes: an addition of 14 sites to the original 376 sites identified as priority. I'm okay with the decisions that have to be made in the interest of expediency.
Thanks!
Ben

From: John.Forrest@epamail.epa.gov [ mailto:John.Forrest@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 1:10 PM

To: Jessup, Benjamin

Subject: Re: NM nutrients - Revised site list

Ben -

Is this an addition of 14 sites to the original 376 sites identified as priority?

Bob and Angel are currently working on the list that you provided yesterday and are in the process of doing a bit of clean up on the 376 sites identified as priority for the term of the current TO. They have found ~112 of the 376 were part of the bedded sediment sites and which we have the GIS indicators; also ~10 percent of the 376 sites resides outside NM. We are still discussing how best to expedite GIS indicators for the remaining sites but in lieu of a simply radius buffer, we are exploring using a line buffer using a 12 digit huc (would avoid the time consuming hand delineation of subwatersheds which we simply cannot complete in a two week period) which would capture a greater portion of the watershed than a simple radius buffer. However, there is no firm decision as vet but I will keep you posted allowing you weigh in on the final decision. On the topic of identifying uses for each site, I think that we have a solution by using state 305(b) GIS coverages that are available for NM, CO, AZ, and TX which are current through 2008 to 2010 state dependent.

The addition of temp. will be an easy addition since it's available as part of the prism file from which we get the precipitation data. Additionally, while we probably will not use the geology data in the proof of concept report, we will go ahead and add the geology piece of information since we already have the data set for NM. However, at some future date, we will need to decide how we will classify and use in your analysis.

Regarding time frame, I've communicated to both Bob and Angel that we must have the GIS task completed by no later than end of month allowing you several weeks to complete the preliminary data analysis

and proof of concept report.

Cheers

#### **Forrest**

From: "Jessup, Benjamin" <benjamin.jessup@tetratech.com>

To: Forrest John/R6/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "shelly.lemon@state.nm.us" <shelly.lemon@state.nm.us>

Date: 10/17/2012 10:46 AM

Subject: NM nutrients - Revised site list

#### Hi Forrest:

I revised the list. The high priority list now include 14 additional NMED sites for which diatom data exist. There are a total of 215 sites with diatom data, but most were already in my high priority list. I got these data from Shelly yesterday. Unless we get a list of sites with DO sonde data, the GIS list should now be complete. The sonde data are in multiple spreadsheets and it would be difficult to bring them all together quickly. They require compilation, standardization, QC, etc. I think having the list (189 sites) would be great and we would be able to analyze the data in the future, but compiling the data for the current effort is not possible for me.

Ben Jessup | Senior Scientist, Center for Ecological Science

Direct: 802.229.1059 | Fax: 802.223.6551

benjamin.jessup@tetratech.com| www.ttwater.com

## Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions

73 Main Street, #38 | Montpelier VT 05602

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

[attachment "NMnutrientSites4GISanalysis\_20121017.xlsx" deleted by Forrest John/R6/USEPA/US]